

July 27, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 9559

degree. We can only triumph over that army to the extent that we manage to reduce its morale. Its morale is undermined by inflicting on it defeats and repeated sufferings.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the proposition that Latin American Communists will try to "draw the enemy out of his surroundings, forcing him to fight in places where his living habits clash with the actual situation." In plain language, this means that attempts will be made to force us "the enemy," to fight on unfavorable terrain, and at times and places not of our own choosing.

As Guevara says, this is the example of Vietnam; and if one, two, or more Vietnams can take place simultaneously throughout the world, then U.S. "imperialism" can ultimately be defeated, say the Communists.

## SOVIET "RESTRAINT" ON CASTRO

We have all read newspaper reports in recent days to the effect that the Soviet support for Castro and his subversive activities is actually decreasing. Some maintain that the recent Kosygin-Castro talks in Havana showed that the Soviet Union does not want Castro to try to subvert the other nations of Latin America.

These reports and theories may be true. But what does the evidence indicate?

The evidence shows that the Soviet Union is still propping up the Cuban economy to the tune of more than one million dollars a day.

The evidence shows that the Soviet Union had the second largest delegation—second only to Cuba—at the Tricontinental Conference in January 1966, when the Latin American Solidarity Organization was first organized.

The evidence indicates that Soviet-built weaponry and military equipment is still being placed in Cuba.

The evidence shows that the Soviet technicians are still operating in Cuba, training the Communists in the use of these weapons.

The evidence also indicates that a large quantity of hand weapons, suitable for use in so-called wars of national liberation is coming from the Soviet Union and its satellites.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the evidence does not indicate that the Soviets are waning in their support of Castro and his Communist technique of wars of national liberation.

LATIN AMERICAN SOLIDARITY ORGANIZATION  
(LASO)

What is this Latin American Solidarity Organization that begins its meeting this week in Havana? What are its concrete goals, and who are its members?

The Latin American Solidarity Organization—or LASO—was established on January 16, 1966, immediately following the First Tricontinental Conference of Havana, the complete name of which was the first Afro-Asian-Latin American Peoples' Solidarity Conference. The delegates to the first LASO meeting were the same as those who had participated in the Tricontinental Conference. The meeting of the delegates who established LASO was presided over by Pedro Medina Silva of the so-called Armed Forces of National Liberation—FALN—of Venezuela,

and was attended by several prominent members of the Cuban government, including Prime Minister Fidel Castro, President Osvaldo Dorticos, and Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro, Fidel's brother.

The communique announcing the establishment of the organization said, in part:

The Latin American Solidarity Organization will use all means within its reach to support the liberation movements; it will give firm support to the liberated countries of the three continents that may be the object of imperialist aggression. . . . It will link its action and that of the participating organizations to the activities of the Tricontinental Organization.

Thus, it is clear that the Latin American Solidarity Organization is neither just another Communist-front organization nor a Sunday outing of Marxist intellectuals. It is a concrete organization, with concrete goals. It is linked to the Tricontinental organization by the very communique announcing its establishment. It has as its principal goals the rendering of effective aid to guerrilla groups.

## THREAT TO THE HEMISPHERE

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is something that must be taken seriously as a threat to the security of the hemisphere.

The meeting of the Latin American Solidarity Organization which will begin this week takes on special significance in view of recent developments in Bolivia, Venezuela, Colombia, and Guatemala. In each of these countries, armed guerrilla groups are actively seeking the overthrow of legitimately constituted governments.

## BOLIVIA

In Bolivia, guerrillas are posing a serious threat to government troops, who are experiencing difficulties in coping with the situation. Bolivia is a small but potentially wealthy country, with substantial natural wealth. With a limited national budget, Bolivia may not be able to meet the rising costs of coping with the guerrilla threat.

To whom will Bolivia turn? Clearly, she will have to turn to the United States and to the Organization of American States. It is also widely rumored that Maj. Ernesto "Che" Guevara is alive and is currently in Bolivia leading the guerrillas. Recently, a young Frenchman, one Regis Debray, was captured by Bolivian forces. Debray, a close friend of Castro, had entered Bolivia illegally, and was caught with a guerrilla band. Now that Debray has been captured and is in prison awaiting trial, appeals from the Left have been pouring into Bolivia, claiming that Debray is merely an innocent journalist and philosopher who came to Bolivia to gather firsthand information.

It was this same "philosopher" who declared in a long article published earlier this year in Havana:

A new era is beginning: the era of total class warfare, an era which has no place for compromise or for the sharing of power.

## VENEZUELA

In Venezuela, the situation is becoming equally serious. On May 8 of this year a Cuban-sponsored expedition of

12 men was intercepted as it tried to infiltrate into the country some 60 miles from Caracas. This "invasion," along with a series of terror attacks by guerrillas operating in the mountains, prompted Venezuela to demand an emergency meeting of the Council of the Organization of American States. A special committee has been appointed to meet in Caracas to consider the Cuban problem.

Late last year Venezuelan security forces discovered an elaborate network of guerrilla sanctuaries within the Central University in Caracas. Harbored behind false walls and storing their weapons in women's dormitories, the guerrillas had a comfortable and relatively secure method of operation. From time to time they would go out into the city, commit terrorist acts, and then return to the university.

In March the guerrillas murdered the brother of the Venezuelan Foreign Minister, and dumped his body on a highway near Caracas. It was this murder that deepened the split within the Communist movement in Venezuela.

The city-based Communists favor an approach of becoming "respectable," so as to be able to take advantage of the current "soft" line being peddled by the pro-Soviet wing of the international Communist movement. The guerrillas, or "mountain Communists," scorn the "soft" living of the city, and espouse armed violence as the only effective means for seizing state power. Recently, however, new areas of the country have been subjected to guerrilla attacks, giving rise to fears that a new series of fronts will be established.

As we know, Venezuela is a well-to-do country, but it is questionable if she would be able to sustain a prolonged and intense guerrilla sabotage campaign. We can all remember the tense days of 1963 in Venezuela, when the Communists, in their attempts to intimidate the Venezuelan people and keep them away from the polls, promised to shoot a policeman a day and any other citizen who opposed them and their demands. Many died in the weeks preceding those elections, but the Venezuelan people ignored the Communist threats and turned out in record numbers to vote. Thus, until recently, the guerrillas have not been active.

## COLOMBIA

In Colombia, where guerrilla activities have been increasing in recent months, the situation is also becoming serious. In the Selden committee report of July 3, just over 3 weeks ago, it is stated:

In March and April Communist guerrillas, operating in an area larger than South Vietnam, renewed their attacks and killed over 50 security force personnel in five widespread incidents, including ambush of army patrols, an attack on a police post, and a train robbery.

Just a few days ago the Chief of Staff of the Colombian Army stated that he expects an intensification of guerrilla warfare in Colombia as a result of the Latin American Solidarity Organization meeting. He said:

This conference in Havana, is the work of the Tricontinental and its aim is to give guidance, norms, and suggestions on procedures to the subversive organizations active on the continent.

H 9560

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 27, 1967

As in Venezuela, the Communists in Colombia are divided between "hard-liners" and "soft-liners." Such a division ought properly to contribute to the weakening of communism but it apparently does not, and within the very leadership of the Colombian Communist Party are to be found some of the most blood thirsty and militant guerrillas.

## GUATEMALA

Finally, in Guatemala, there has also been intense rural guerrilla activity, although it seems to have been brought under control for the time being. The one question being asked in relation to the Guatemalan success in suppressing to some extent the guerrilla activities, is the sudden growth of private vigilante groups which exact their own justice from the Communists. Two of these groups, known as MANO<sup>1</sup> and NOA<sup>2</sup>, launched their counter-guerrilla campaign by declaring that they would murder five Communists for every murder committed by the guerrillas. As time passed, the organizations raised the ratio, until at one point they were threatening with a ratio of 20 to 1. In recent months, there appears to have been a dramatic decrease in the number of murders committed by the Guatemalan Communist guerrillas. It will be instructive to observe developments in Guatemala following the LASO meeting.

## WHO CONTROLS CASTRO?

Mr. Speaker, the question is frequently asked, "Who controls Castro—Moscow or Peking?" I do not pretend to have a categorical answer to this question, but I would like to discuss it very briefly.

Earlier I spoke of the long-standing claims that Fidel Castro's Cuba would eventually collapse under its own bureaucratic inefficiency and mismanagement, and the Soviet Union would one day tire of pumping a million dollars a day into a "worthless" island in the Caribbean. We know now that predictions of that sort were tantamount to whistling in the dark; that they provided a ready excuse for inaction in the matter of Cuba; and that they carried the day for the "cooler-heads-will-prevail" school of thought which seems to arise with each crisis situation, and which seems to impute to those who would act forthrightly the opposing label of "hot-heads."

One might justifiably ask whether it really matters at this point who controls Castro. Does it do any good to debate such points when Castro himself is defying the will of the majority of Latin America and is openly trying to overthrow Latin American governments?

We have seen that President Johnson's administration is taking far too lightly the Latin American meeting of Communist strategists opening Friday in Havana. Administration preoccupation with Vietnam and apparent complacency with Communist subversive planning on our country's own doorstep may result in an outbreak of several Viet-

nanis in Latin America in the next few years as Red leaders have boasted.

## BRIDGE BUILDING

So now let us return to the issue of Soviet support for Castro. Since Moscow is supporting Castro, should we not be forthright in our vigorous condemnation of the Soviet Union? Is it not true that Moscow's current support level of one million dollars per day is assisting the guerrilla bands operating on the Latin American continent? And if that is the case, how can East-West trade and "bridge building" to the East make any sense at all?

We have seen that the administration insists on its overtures to the East, complete with large-scale credits and enormous relaxation of the export control list, in spite of increased Soviet and East European support to Vietnam. Does it not also make sense that our credits to the East will help to support, even if only indirectly, guerrilla warfare in Latin America?

In the past, we have often had a difficult time in persuading our partners in the Organization of American States that joint action is necessary to deal with Fidel Castro. Now, when virtually all the Latin American countries are prepared to act, we seem to be dragging our feet. Why? Will the mere passage of time gain us anything? Will it "solve" the problem in the "let-cooler-heads-prevail tradition"?

By now we are well aware of the elementary fact of international life that problems do not diminish with the passage of time; on the contrary, they become magnified and fester, until eventually a full-scale crisis is born. It is precisely that kind of full-scale crisis, requiring American or allied intervention that must be avoided. And it can be avoided by swift and forceful united action.

It is possible, of course, that the administration will prefer to adopt a "wait and see" attitude until after the Latin American Solidarity Organization meeting ends next week. But since it is already possible to guess what general formula for violence will emanate from the LASO meeting, what basic preparation are being made to seek meaningful joint action to deal with Castro-supported violence and subversion?

We will recall that, following the Tricontinental Conference of January 1966, the Latin American countries protested vigorously the Cuban, Egyptian, Chinese, and Soviet support of the meeting. The ink was barely dry on United Nations Resolution 2131, which proclaimed the inadmissibility of interference in the affairs of sovereign states, when the Tricontinental Conference met to map out a program for armed interference in the affairs of other sovereign states. At that time, the United States did nothing to unit the Americas to face up to the Cuban danger.

What will be the U.S. attitude in the forthcoming Latin American Solidarity Organization meeting comes out four-square for violent revolution?

Will the administration wait until the "other Vietnam" which the guerrilla

leader Guevara called for, have sprouted up, to take action? Will the administration refuse to use the more humane but effective weapons which are available to us—primarily economic, political, and psychological—until it is too late, and we are forced again to use military means?

## WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

In the meeting of the Tricontinental Conference of January 1966 we have seen what the designs of the world Communist movement are for the underdeveloped world.

And, yes, I do not hesitate to use the phrase "world Communist movement." We have all heard too much about the alleged "disintegration" of world communism. It is time to look hard and long at such evidence as: Who participates in these meetings? You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the three largest delegations at the Tricontinental Conference were the Cuban, Soviet, and Communist Chinese, in that order. Thus, we hear speculation about this disintegration and in some respects it may be true. But clearly, when we are speaking of subverting the legitimate governments of the "third world," we are talking about a unified, broad-based strategy, composed of all the leading world Communists.

Who lends support to the guerrilla movements around the world? Again, we find that it is all of the Communist world that is supporting North Vietnam in its aggression against the south. Just as support for other guerrilla activities in various countries around the world comes from all of the Communist countries.

It is this "hard look at the evidence" which the administration has failed to take. It is here that the Congress can play a truly vital role, as the reports which I have already mentioned, show. It is in this spirit, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to take the floor of the House later, when the meeting of the Latin American Solidarity Organization is over, and the evidence is in, to again apprise my colleagues of the import of this meeting.

It will be most interesting, Mr. Speaker, to observe the reaction of the administration to what takes place in Havana.

Many Members of both Houses are watching with great interest the revolutionary performance that is to be put on this week in Havana. They will also be watching with great interest to see if we respond appropriately. For this is an issue which cuts across the aisles of both Houses, and which touches our domestic security. Members of the Congress, as well as the American people, will indeed be watching Havana and Washington.

## ARMED SHIPMENTS TO JORDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, news dispatches from Jordan inform us that King Hussein is planning to arm the civilians of that nation, and to institute a program

<sup>1</sup> El Mano—"The Hand"

<sup>2</sup> NOA—"New Anticommunist Organization"

July 27, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 9561

of general military training for all Jordanians.

At the same time, the administration of the United States is quietly seeking methods of financing new shipments of arms and military equipment to Jordan.

It is easy to add the two facts and come up with a terrifying total of more war, more bloodshed, and more destruction in the ravaged Middle East.

I take this floor to announce that I, for one, will never support any authorization for more arms to Jordan until that nation justifies its statement that its program of military rearmament is planned only for defensive purposes.

The only way Jordan can prove that intention is by signing a peace treaty with Israel, because as long as Jordan remains at war with Israel, we can expect any American armaments and supplies to be used in eventual battle against Israel.

I ask my colleagues to remember that King Hussein has collaborated with the Communists and the Arabs, who are threatening Israel and the West. Israel is our only ally in that dark and bloody corner of the world, and the future of Israel is inextricably bound up with America's best interests.

It should be made absolutely clear to King Hussein, now and not at some vague future time, that unless he shows concrete evidence of responsibility by signing a peace treaty with Israel, that American taxpayers will not be asked to provide Jordan with a single bullet.

By that, Mr. Speaker, I mean that arms should not be provided either directly or indirectly. I have been deeply concerned with the possibility that some indirect means of arms aid to Jordan might be devised, since the revelations made by Mr. WIDNALL last weekend about armament financing by the Export-Import Bank.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], one of the most distinguished members of the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, pointed out that in 2 years, 39 percent of the Bank's loans were made for arms purchases. What is more, large credits were granted to nations without the official knowledge of executives of the bank.

I join the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] in demanding a thorough review of the Bank's financing of arms sales to foreign nations, before we are asked to extend the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank. And I insist that no such credits be granted to Jordan, or any other Arab nation, until it agrees to end the state of war in the Middle East.

It is all the more important that the United States take a firm stand in this matter, in view of the sinister Russian resupply of offensive arms to Egypt and Syria, which must one day tempt those nations to make a sneak "Pearl Harbor" attack on Israel, unless we demonstrate our support of Israel by providing that pro-American nation with all necessary arms.

Such a demonstration becomes a vital factor in keeping the Middle Eastern tinderbox from bursting into flame once

more, since France cynically terminated its sale of jets to Israel in a bid for Arab and Communist favor.

The least we can do is to supply Israel with all necessary jets and other equipment to replace Israeli equipment depleted in the conflict, and to balance the new flow of Mig-23's and other super-sophisticated weapons from Russia to the Arabs.

We owe this support to a nation which has stood for 20 years as a bastion of democracy in a most undemocratic part of the world. We also owe it to mankind as our contribution toward maintaining the balance which may overcome the inflammatory warmongering of puppet-Arab overlords and the Communist plotters who pull the strings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

[Mr. DUNCAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

## RIOT DISASTER AREAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the terrible outbreaks of mass violence in many cities this summer have torn the fabric of our entire society. All America has been badly hurt, but the most immediate victims are the wounded and the dead, the families whose homes have been destroyed, the businessman whose stores and stocks have been wrecked, the children who have been deprived of food and clothes, and the citizens whose neighborhoods have been completely smashed.

We do not in any way condone mob violence, criminal assaults on life and property, and anarchic attacks on law and order. But we cannot condemn the innocent victims of this violence to a future more povertystricken and hopeless than their past.

The physical destruction wreaked by riots has in some cities been worse than that which could be caused by a hurricane or quake. The emotional devastation wrought has been far greater, because these have been not natural disasters beyond man's control, but disasters born of human excesses, multiplied to inhuman proportions.

I believe that the victims of these explosions should receive emergency assistance equal to that traditionally given to the victims of natural disasters.

The existing powers of the executive branch in such situations are unspecified and unclear. Just this afternoon the Office of Emergency Planning, in response to Governor Romney's formal request for disaster aid for Detroit, has indicated that legal grounds for action may not exist at all.

Accordingly, 14 of our colleagues have joined me today in introducing legislation to amend existing Federal disaster relief laws to cover major riots and civil disorders explicitly. Cosponsoring this measure with me are Representatives ALPHONZO BELL, DANIEL E. BUTTON, SILVIO O. CONTE, GERALD R. FORD, PETER H. B. FREILINGHUYSEN, GILBERT GUDÉ, SEYMOUR HALPERN, FRANK J. HORTON, THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, F. BRADFORD MORSE, ROGERS C. B. MORTON, CHARLES A. MOSHER, OGDEN R. REID, and HOWARD W. ROBISON.

The Federal laws affected are—

First. The basic disaster program, under which the Office of Emergency Planning may step in, upon the request of the Governor and approval of the President, to provide a wide range of emergency services to supplement inadequate local and State resources. The help provided through OEP may include emergency food, clothing, shelter and medical supplies; equipment, materials and technical services; temporary repairs and replacement of existing public facilities and services, including police and fire protection; and clearing of wreckage and debris, especially where serious public health menaces exist.

Presidential designation of an area as a major disaster area also makes a stricken region eligible for refinancing of loans from HUD and the VA for public facilities; gives priority status to applications for public facilities assistance, public housing and public works planning; waives certain planning requirements for urban renewal programs; and makes individuals eligible for Federal tax deduction of losses due to the disaster and not covered by insurance or other compensation. Aid in rebuilding schools would be provided under Public Law 89-313, which expired on July 1, but has been extended by the House in legislation—H.R. 7819—now awaiting Senate action.

Second. The disaster loan provisions of the Small Business Act, through which low-interest—3 percent—SBA loans may be made to small businesses suffering serious economic damage from disasters. Such loans may presently be made in natural disaster areas either on presidential designation or on action by the SBA Administrator.

Third. The loan insurance programs of the Federal Housing Administration, through which FHA will insure commercial loans for the repair, rebuilding or replacement of homes and other structures damaged or destroyed by disasters.

These programs, admittedly modest, cannot repair or compensate for all the damage done. They have proved very valuable, however, in the aftermath of devastating hurricanes, floods, earthquakes, and tornadoes. They could prove equally constructive in starting the massive task of lifting shattered urban cores toward social health and economic life.

This proposal is an emergency measure, proposed for use in exceptionally tragic times. It is not offered as an answer to the riots. Rather, it is advanced as a humanitarian response to the havoc which violence has brought and the harm it has inflicted on so many Americans.

H 9562

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 27, 1967

The tasks ahead of us will require many years and demand great effort and investment. We believe that vigorous, compassionate relief efforts, beginning now, are essential to meet the most urgent needs of the people of the stricken slums, and show that we shall not abandon them.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the proposed legislation is designed to help the innocent victim of the riot and not the lawbreakers themselves?

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentleman from Virginia has raised that question, because I think it is stated unequivocally that the purpose of this legislation, and the language and the words of this legislation, are directed only to the innocent victims, many of whom disparage disorders that are ruinous and many of whom resisted the riots that surged around them, but who were nonetheless wiped out of their material possessions. It is an important point. I am glad the gentleman has raised it.

Mr. Speaker. I yield back the balance of my time.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VIGORITO). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. GOODELL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. MOORE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

## REQUEST THAT SPECIAL ORDER BE REINSTATE

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I previously asked unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes which was agreed to under special order. At the time that special order was called, I was in the Speaker's Lobby and could not respond at that moment.

I now ask unanimous consent that the time allowed be reinstated and I be permitted to proceed under special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

## AMERICAN TRAGEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time because under the 1-minute rule there is hardly enough time to cover even one facet of events that have transpired in this week of American tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, half the Members of the House have stood in this well, at some time this week to speak on the race violence in Newark, Plainfield, Detroit, Cambridge, and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the time is here for this Congress to act when one of our local papers carries the very serious headline which—in two words summarizes this situation, "American Tragedy."

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the Members of the House of the fact that the situation is not getting any better.

Since July 10, our summer of 1967 has witnessed outbreaks of violence at the following places on the dates indicated:

July 12: Newark, N.J., Hartford, Conn., Erie, Pa.

July 16: Des Moines, Iowa.

July 17: Plainfield, N.J.

July 19: Nyack, N.Y.

July 21: Minneapolis, Minn.

July 22: Youngstown, Ohio.

July 23: New York, N.Y.

July 23: Detroit, Mich.

July 24: Cambridge, Md., Rochester, N.Y., Toledo, Ohio, Pontiac, Mich., Flint, Mich., Lansing, Mich.

Just before I came on to the floor I was out in the Speaker's Lobby scanning the Associated Press teletype. I took the liberty to tear off the portion of the roll as it was being hung on our bulletin board. To furnish as a basis for some of the remarks I will make in a few minutes, I want to call to the attention of the House today, Thursday afternoon, July 27, item 16 was headed "Phoenix Racial Riot," pointing out that violence and vandalism has erupted for the second night in that city.

Item 17 was on "Cambridge," which pointed out that teargas had to be used in Cambridge, Md., to disperse a mob of rock-throwing Negroes.

Item 18 pointed out that a mob of Negro teenagers ran rampant on fashionable Fifth Avenue in New York City looting one man's shop of over \$15,000 of merchandise and at Columbus Circle a Negro mob attacked a young married couple disrobing the woman and robbing her husband.

The next item was entitled "Chicago Racial," reporting incidents of firebombing, window smashing, and looting on the West Side Wednesday night.

"Cincinnati Racial" mentioned the fact firebombs flew again in that southeastern Ohio city with a new damage estimated at \$250,000 and a department store building set on fire by firebombs

and other fires including a paper box factory.

Toledo in northern Ohio was not spared. There 48 arrests were made when firefighters were attacked by gangs.

On the west coast, San Francisco police had to seal off 30 blocks in the Fillmore district when gangs of Negroes started throwing firebombs.

Back on the east coast, Philadelphia policemen arrested 35 persons in South Philadelphia for window breaking in South Philadelphia.

These incidents happened in our America within the last 24 hours, but without a doubt the most shocking of all were the comments made right here in our Nation's Capital by H. Rap Brown, who told a crowd of a hundred or more applauding Negroes to get guns because if Washington "don't come round Washington should be burned down."

If there should be any doubt that my comments are based on hearsay, I hold here in my hand a tearsheet which has just been taken from the teletype and is marked item 112, Associated Press, entitled "Rap Brown in Washington."

The man who spoke those words in Washington today is the same H. Rap Brown who was chairman of the National Conference on Black Power held in Newark last weekend. It is the same H. Rap Brown who was finally arrested over at the National Airport, and held a short time in the Alexandria, Va., city jail under a proceeding against him as a fugitive.

According to our Washington papers, Rap Brown, who is Stokely Carmichael's successor as national chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, was released in Alexandria late after midnight last night when he was freed on bail under a bond arranged by one of the ousted teachers from Howard University. He now faces extradition to Dorchester County, Md., where he is charged with making a speech that touched off a night of arson and shooting in Cambridge last Monday evening. One question that will be asked by many is why the delay until August 26 for arraignment on the charge that he is a fugitive and should face extradition.

Mr. Speaker, there has been far too much levity made even by ordinarily serious-minded Members of this House and more by others outside the Congress of the antiriot bill recently passed by the House as a deterrent against those who would travel interstate to incite riots.

Well, in answer to those who would laugh at this bill, it can be answered that here in Rap Brown we have an example or illustration that should serve to emphasize and underscore the fact that this antiriot bill which assesses a substantial penalty against those individuals traveling from State to State to incite a riot is needed and could be made useful and effective against madmen like H. Rap Brown, who traveled Interstate from Newark to Cambridge, Md., and now to the Nation's Capital.

About all you have to do is look at what happened within the last few days. Brown stood up in Cambridge, Md., and made a speech before 400 youths urging

July 27, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3815

has taught us that the foot soldier is still our most indispensable force for national security. And this war has also emphasized that all of the computers and tabulators in the world cannot replace an inspiring and courageous general.

Lewis Walt is such a general. He enjoys the respect and affection of the Marines he led into battle.

Lewis Walt knows the enemy—but he knows the people of South Vietnam, too. He has planned and successfully executed slashing attacks—but he has also helped to plan and build peaceful economic, and social development in the countryside. He knows the Vietnamese as do few Americans. And he likes and admires them—and believes in their future.

General Walt's associates consider him to possess an ideal combination of practical combat experience, military leadership and managerial skill, together with a rare dedication, sincerity, and warmth. These traits blend into a rare leadership ability—perhaps best demonstrated in Vietnam where he led and organized the activities of all agencies—United States and Vietnamese, military and civilian—into productive and effective programs.

General Westmoreland has said of Lewis Walt:

He's not only big physically, but big morally.

This sums up the kind of man the general is.

The general is an excellent speaker—a fact many Americans around the country are discovering for themselves. He has been meeting with civic and educational groups whenever possible, reporting on Vietnam and placing the conflict in true perspective.

Let me share with my colleagues some of his thoughts as expressed before the Texas delegation, and from other appearances across the country.

On the nature of the war in Vietnam, the general said:

This is one of the most complicated, complex, frustrating, multi-sided efforts we've ever been engaged in . . . We're fighting it—and I mean our government and the government and people of Vietnam—in the political . . . sociological . . . economic . . . psychological . . . and military arenas—all at the same time.

General Walt believes that our objectives in the I Corps area to be both destructive and constructive. He says:

We have to destroy the armed enemy. But, we have to positively assist the Vietnamese people to rebuild their country and to shape their own destiny.

He emphasizes that our military efforts in Vietnam are a "shield behind which reconstruction may start and have some chance of succeeding." We have to assist the people "to reconstitute their government and their social institutions, reconstruct their schools, their homes and their means for making a living. Make no mistake—both sides are after the people.

He has little patience with those who are overly critical of the South Vietnamese military. He says:

They are short of manpower, of leadership, of trained personnel. Well, why shouldn't they be? Those people have been fighting this war for 18 years. I've got the fullest confidence in the potential of their armed forces.

And he says that in the I Corps area the Vietnamese forces have done "a magnificent job."

He emphasizes over and over that this is a battle to win not territory—but the minds and hearts of the people.

"In this war a soldier has to be much more than a man with a rifle or a man whose only object is to kill. He has to be part diplomat, part technician, part politician—and 100 percent human being.

Our men have met this challenge. They are young and resourceful fighting men who can look the VC in the eye one day and show a villager how to build a playground for the children, the next.

The general says:

I have never ceased to be amazed by the understanding of these young Americans. They've come to a totally foreign environment, met a people beleaguered by 18 years of war, suspicious of foreigners, as far removed from the American experience as if they'd come from another planet, yet the American serviceman can grasp the plight of these Vietnamese, and he can sympathize with them and understand them.

Our troops, he says, are the ambassadors at the hamlet level. And they do a really superior job.

The general makes clear that he believes in the future of the South Vietnamese. I Corps, he says, was long believed to be a very poor part of South Vietnam because it has not been able to produce enough food for the people there. But, he says, this is not because the capability is not there. I Corps now has the only coal mine in South Vietnam—a mine taken from the Vietcong. This mine is now under government control and under U.S. protection. It is producing several hundred million tons of coal, and the Vietnamese are building a large thermal electric plant in the area to serve all five of the northern provinces with electricity.

At present, only the cities have electric power. But once electricity is installed in these rural areas, the farmers will be able to install water pumps in the rivers and pump water into nearby rice paddies. This means they will have two crops each year, instead of just one.

The Vietnamese are also building a fertilizer plant as a byproduct of the coal, and this fertilizer can be used by all of the rice paddies in I Corps area. The meaning of this, says the general, is that rice production will increase by nearly three times as much as is now presently produced, enabling Vietnam to better feed its own people.

He notes other fine economic potentials in the I Corps area: abundant sugarcane—a sugar mill is being started with American help; excellent fishing—a cannery factory is being planned—and some of the world's loveliest beaches that could make the area "the playground of Southeast Asia."

These objectives, the general makes clear, will not be accomplished overnight. But he does think that we are headed in the right direction. In his words:

We are making progress . . . and I am confident of the outcome.

Nor does the general predict a quick outcome to the fighting. The war, he feels, depends on two factors: First, how many troops the North Vietnamese Army

is going to throw down on us and keep taking the terrible losses they are taking. Second, how many troops we are going to put in the country to stop them.

General Walt thinks we may be in Vietnam for as long as 12 to 15 years. He does not think the fighting will rage that long, but American forces will be needed to maintain security. He notes that our troops have been stationed in Korea for a long time. And he adds that South Vietnam has as much potential for economic and political growth as Korea, and a strong South Vietnam will give the United States a strong and valued ally in Southeast Asia to block Communist forces in that part of the world.

To Lewis Walt, there is no confusion or apprehension about America's commitment to the people of South Vietnam.

We cannot abandon these people. For, as the General said:

If we withdrew it would only be a matter of a few days before the Viet Cong would be back in, and they would be killing.

I am proud of a country that is able to produce men like General Walt. And I am delighted that the American people now have an opportunity to see and listen to the General explain our hopes and aspirations for the people of South Vietnam. The General is neither a hawk nor a dove. He is only a peace-seeker—dedicated to a fair and prompt settlement of this costly and bloody war. But he is also committed to our seeing the job through until a settlement can be reached with the Communists.

And here, too, he reflects our Nation's hope that ways can be found to induce Hanoi to join with us in the search for peace. But until that day comes, Lewis Walt and others like him, will shoulder the burden of securing a decent life for a people and a country that have known little but war all of their lives.

He told us:

The most dramatic change that I have observed out there in the past two years is the attitude of the people. Two years ago that Vietnamese people in I Corps were fraught with fear. Today, they are gaining confidence in their own government and in their own institutions and they see a much better world for themselves resulting from our presence in that troubled country.

*file*  
Statement on the Middle East Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we have been subjected to such a barrage of propaganda by the Communist nations and their Arab fellow travelers at the United Nations and elsewhere that it would appear that Israel, a free world nation of 2½ million people, sought to take over the vast lands of the estimated 450 million Moslems of the world.

The intended victim, Israel, successfully resisted a Communist-inspired and Communist-armed so-called war of na-

A 3816

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 27, 1967

tional liberation. A Soviet plot to dominate the Middle East was frustrated by Israel's valor and military skill. Israel is ready to discuss withdrawal from cease-fire lines on the basis of a permanent peace settlement and adequate, reasonable, security guarantees.

Yet we hear such a one-sided blast from the Communists and Arabs that the whole brutal spectacle of the Arabs ganging up on Israel before June 5 has become a desert mirage, a sort of "instant" distortion of history.

Israel refused to submit to aggression or to bow before the threats and taunts of Moscow. The Russians are using the Israel issue, emotionally volatile to the Arabs, as a device to penetrate the Moslem world. The Communists hope to exploit the Israel issue from Morocco to Indonesia.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, to set the record straight. History is beginning to repeat itself. The Soviet Union has embarked on a massive program of resupply of jets and tanks to Egypt and Syria. Egypt already has received more than half of the number of jets destroyed by Israel.

The Russians have ignored the State Department's pious pleas for limitation of arms shipments to the region. It is obvious that the Russians have no moral concern for limitation of tensions. They want to stir up and exploit further Arab bellicosity and passions. They want to use the Israel issue for all its worth. They have discovered a gimmick to divert America from the unfinished task in Vietnam.

Failure by the United States to implement commitments to Israel has been noted by NATO allies. The West Germans observed that President Johnson failed to test the Egyptian blockade of the Strait of Tiran. Today the German press asks about the validity of our guarantees on Berlin. The wishy-washy stand of the administration in the Middle East has undermined the strength of our commitments and eroded the value of the sacrifices in Vietnam by our martyrs.

The Russian fleet enters Egyptian ports and threatens open intervention. We make no answer. The Arabs see strength on one side, timidity on the other.

Let us be consistent. Communism is communism, whether in Southeast Asia or the Middle East. Moscow is still trying to bury us.

Russian actions speak louder than their words. President Johnson may be enchanted with his summit talks at Glassboro, N.J. But none of the alleged magic of personal contact has been revealed to us in the Middle East. The Soviet Union has shown not a spirit of Hollybush, but a spirit of guided-missile cruisers in Port Said and Alexandria.

The Russians are pushing for weak spots, trying to penetrate wherever we show weakness or confusion.

The time has come for us to draw a line in the Middle East. If not, we will permit the Russians to turn defeat into victory.

Let the State Department not become

so mesmerized by hopes to restore relations with Arab nations now hostile to us that we appease both Arabs and Communists in a one-sided and disastrous bid for detente.

We are beginning to forget that the conflict in the Middle East started when the Arabs, armed and encouraged by Russia, decided to gang up on Israel, cut off her access to the seas, mass on her borders, and destroy that pro-Western democracy. Israel was termed an "outpost of imperialism" because of her friendship with America and the free world.

The world saw another saga of David dealing with Goliath. But Goliath is being revived.

I call attention of the House to the following transcript of actual statements by Arab leaders at the outbreak of the war last month. The Russians would rewrite history in the manner of "1984" to distort the facts. The time has come to refresh our insights on how the present situation came about.

The transcription of Arab statements of June 4 and 5 follows:

ARAB STATEMENTS PRIOR TO THE EGYPTIAN  
ATTACK ON JUNE 5, 1967

1. President Nasser of Egypt, 1730 GMT, June 4: "The Iraqi forces have moved and so did the heroic Iraqi Army and the Iraqi people. The whole Arab nation has moved. . . . We had to prepare ourselves for the decisive battle with the enemy and when we felt we were ready, we retrieved our right. The UNEF was evacuated and we returned to the Gulf of Aqaba, which we have closed. The UNEF is finished—it has left our country and it will not return again . . . Today we tell them (Israel) we are facing you in the battle and are burning with desire for it to start in order to get revenge for the 1956 treachery."

2. President Arif of Iraq, 1620 GMT, June 4: "Brothers and guests. God has imposed a Holy War on us. We will thus be participating with our brother strugglers on the borders of Palestine in the Arabs' great battle in our sacred land where our flags have been raised once more."

3. King Hussein of Jordan, 1600 GMT, June 4: "Today the Arab nation is moving as one nation to face its responsibilities. We are ready to fight to the end for our legitimate rights. The entire Jordanian people have risen to the level of battle."

JUNE 5, 1967—THE ARABS ATTACK ISRAEL

1. Amman Radio, Jordan, 0720 GMT, June 5: "The Arab nation has united its views and ranks to repel every aggression and restore the usurped rights and territory. Masses of our Arab nation: Rest assured and be joyful about the imminent return and liberation."

2. Amman Radio, Jordan, 1015 GMT, June 5: "Jordanian Royal Air Force planes have begun bombing targets in the enemy territory. The bombing is still in progress."

3. Amman Radio, Jordan, 1035 GMT, June 5: Proclamation by Joint Command: "The Jordanian, Iraqi, and Syrian air forces are carrying out joint air operations and bombing targets inside our occupied territory. The bombing is still in progress."

4. Amman Radio, Jordan, 1040, GMT, June 5: Proclamation of Jordanian military spokesman: "Our valiant forces have occupied Jabal Mukabbar in Jerusalem. The enemy is fleeing before our advancing forces south of Jerusalem. A great fire broke out in five settlements (in Israel) as a result of bombardment by our artillery."

5. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0715 GMT, June 5: "Arab brothers: The battle with the state

of gangs has begun. To arms, O Arabs. To arms, masses of our people. The hour of the battle has struck and the march toward Palestine has begun."

6. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0725 GMT, June 5: "Comrades in arms in Cairo, Gaza, Sharm El-Sheikh, and Sinai, and masses of our people in Jordan. We are at your side in the glorious march towards Tel Aviv. Damascus, the people, the Socialist Arab Bath Party, are responding. Strike and we are on your side on the firing line."

7. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0745 GMT, June 5: "Brothers: Today is your day, the day of freedom and the day of the return. Millions of Arabs are backing you. Strike! Millions of free people in the world support you. Strike! The toilers and honest people bless your step. Strike! They bless you as you radiate fire and light. Strike. Strike. Strike!"

8. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0815 GMT, June 5: "Our Arab land, flame up and burn the invaders. Destroy them all. To arms, O Arabs! To the heart of occupied Palestine! Rendezvous in Tel Aviv, O Arabs! Crush the aggressor invaders, the Zionists, and crush the United States!"

9. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0900 GMT, June 5: Statement by the Supreme Commander of the Army: "The zero-hour has begun. Our planes are now shelling the enemy's cities, positions, and installations. O masses of our Arab people: Arab Syria has entered the battle. Syria is now engaging the enemy and destroying its positions. The Arab revolution will not retreat before fully destroying the Israeli existence in our Arab homeland."

10. President Al-Atasi of Syria, 1220 GMT, June 5: "Our present battle will be one of final liberation of the usurped territory from imperialism and Zionism. No international force can oppose the will of the struggling Arab people."

11. Damascus Radio, Syria, 1030 GMT, June 5: "At 1200 today a telephone contact took place between President Jamal Abd an-Nasir and Chief of State Dr. Nur ad-Din al-Atasi. President Abd an-Nasir emphasized that the Arab people in Egypt and their valiant army are determined to follow the battle to the end. Chief of State Dr. Nur ad-Din al-Atasi emphasized that the Arab people in Syria and their valiant army are determined to continue the battle until victory."

12. Damascus Radio, Syria, 1322 GMT, June 5: "Iraqi President Abd ar-Rahman Arif has contacted Chief of State Dr. Nur ad-Din al-Atasi by telephone. During the conversation the two leaders affirmed the two countries' determination to fight the battle of the Arab nation until victory is achieved."

13. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0455 GMT, June 6: "A direct telephone conversation took place last night between Algerian President Houari Boumedienne and Chief of State Dr. Nur ad-Din al-Atasi. The Algerian President affirmed support of the Algerian Arab people, army, and revolution for the Syrian revolution in the fateful battle of the Arab nation, the battle for the liberation of Palestine."

14. Jidda Radio, Saudi Arabia, 2140 GMT, June 5: King Feisal: "The Saudi Arabian Kingdom considers Israel's presence in the heart of the Arab world a war against all the Arab world. Therefore, the Saudi Arabian Kingdom is in a permanent state of war against the existence of Israel until such existence ceases. Our forces' entrance into fraternal Jordan, the honorable battle they are now waging together with the other Arab forces in the fateful battle, and our employment of all our resources for this battle are but a confirmation of our declaration of war against the Zionist gangs."

July 27, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3839

lucky enough to have jobs have no hope of advancing, because the Spanish-surnamed minority is, in general, undereducated and without the skills necessary for finding a good job or advancing. Many struggle against ill health. Others face the harshest kind of discrimination, and a few are hapless victims of exploitation. The absence of opportunity and the inability to grasp what opportunities exist plague them.

Statistics can measure only tangibles. The effect of degradation on a man's soul has yet to find expression in a mathematical table. There is no machine to explain what happens to a man when he loses hope, or when he abandons the idea that tomorrow may bring better things. Nor is there any way of reckoning the tragic cost incurred by the waste of human talents that have never reached their potential, of lives that have never been able to contribute their full value to society. But no one should need a yardstick to measure the depths of despair among the Spanish-surnamed. It should be enough for a man of conscience simply to know that it exists, and this knowledge ought to drive him to action and cause him to seek ways to renew the vigor of life and hope where it is perilously close to fading away. There need be no accurate measurement of the cost to all men when some men begin to feel that tomorrow, if it comes, will be no better than today.

There is a whisper of change in the Southwest today. Americans of Spanish surname are beginning to seek an identity of their own, and they are searching for definable goals. They are anxious to reclaim hope, and ready to bring into reality the promise of the future. They are beginning to know what the American dream is, and they are ready to claim it for their own, as have so many other minorities before them.

Much of this renewed vigor has come about because of the commitment of the Johnson Administration to campaign against poverty and all its evils and ills. It is the war on poverty that has made it possible for so many Americans of Spanish surname to see hope over the horizon and to know that there are attainable improvements in life. The realization that there are attainable goals has caused them to seek goals that are even higher, and better, and farther away.

An administration that has committed itself to bringing about social change immediately faces several difficulties. In the first place, not everyone is in favor of social change; it upsets comfortable patterns of the past and it creates general unrest. Men who are suddenly no longer willing to remain poor are not happy with things as they are, and may (and very likely will) make demands that would have been unheard of in earlier times. Secondly, a government is not the best instrument for bringing about social change. Not all civil servants are dedicated to the new ideas implicit in programs that are innovative. Many men to whom the administration of the war on poverty is entrusted are timid generals; they are fearful of making mistakes, fearful of arousing controversy, fearful of contradicting ideas of their superiors, and anxious to win promotion. Taken together, these inhibitions cause government in general to have slow reflexes, and new programs in particular to have a striking similarity to old ones. Then, too, a great many administrators know all too well that this program, too, will pass—very likely before they do.

## COMMITTED TO IDEA

Despite the general difficulties of using government as the instrument of social change, the Administration is committed to the idea, and this commitment has produced striking results. There are young men learning new skills in the Job Corps; there are

Neighborhood Youth Corpsmen learning how to learn and work, and getting pocket money for their pains (badly needed skills, and even more badly needed money); there are Volunteers in Service to America learning how it is to be poor, and trying to teach the poor that there really is a way out of the trap of poverty; and there is more than that.

Most of all, there is a reviving feeling among the poor, and among the Spanish-surnamed, that it really is possible for things to get better.

If a man is so poor that he exists on the borderline of starvation, life is a day-to-day matter. He feels lucky if he has enough to eat. Such a man, struggling with all his wit and strength to get a meal or two, has no time to think about the future, and if he gets a few cents ahead, he is likely to spend his pennies seeking the relief of pleasure. After all, there may never be another chance to have some fun. On the other hand, if a man is in a state of more or less tolerable poverty, he does have some time to think about the future. He is able to feel resentment that others have more than he is able to possess; he is able to dream of having more tomorrow than he has today. Such a man is capable of having hope, and capable of yearning for tomorrow to come, because it may very well be a better day. The Spanish-surnamed population, more and more, is unhappy with the present and ready for tomorrow, and new opportunity, to come.

Having provided the sustenance of hope and the fires of ambition, the Government must now take steps to see that the new dreams of the Spanish-surnamed American population are turned into realities. No man's hunger is satisfied if he is only shown a menu: food alone will suffice. The vigor and leadership that have so far been offered must be continued, even redoubled.

Count Leo Tolstoy observed the tragedy of paper reforms in the Russia of 1812. He wrote, in *WAR AND PEACE*, of a young aristocrat, Count Bezushov, who had inherited a vast estate. He was a reformer and something of a mystic. He decided that he would bring a new order of life into being on his property. So Bezushov ordered his overseer to provide schools for the peasants on the estates, and medical care for them, and all manner of other reforms calculated to make human beings and reasonably free people of the serfs. But the Count lived in Moscow and St. Petersburg and never visited his estates. The overseer did very little about instituting reforms, and in fact conditions for the serfs got worse. The Count did not know this because all he knew was what the overseer told him, and the overseer sent glowing reports of progress. Promises and the best of intentions, without leadership and energetic administration, can never produce real results.

Americans of Spanish surname, who have furnished the muscles that turned much of the Southwest from arid desert into miraculously productive farmlands, who laid the rails and plucked the cotton, who dug the ditches and laid the foundations of our cities, and who have willingly laid down their lives to defend it all, now know that the great American dream, so long denied, can be theirs. Having done so much to create this hope and vision, the Administration must pursue its course to open new opportunities. The penalty for failure will be great, for the power of human aspiration may well overcome the saving grace of patience. But the rewards of success will be even greater. No one really knows what the cost has been of permitting misery and degradation to exist for so long. The only way of finding out is to help these millions of willing and able people to realize their full potential, and give their full measure to our country's wealth, and take their fair share from it.

## Air Safety Article by Associated Press

Writer Blaine Powlee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OFHON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.  
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have often stated my belief that Congress and the American people need to know more, much more, about ideas, attitudes, and development in the field of air safety. Recently, a seminar was conducted as part of the program of the inaugural convention of the International Society of Barristers. I feel that the ideas expressed by the panel of experienced men are worthy of consideration, and I wish to include in the RECORD the Associated Press account of their views:

## AIR SAFETY

CHICAGO.—A panel of aviation law specialists agreed today that near collisions of airplanes are far more frequent than generally known and that development of air safety devices lags "far behind the development of the industry."

They said that while air travel still is "acceptably safe," it is nowhere near as safe as the airlines' "admirable job of publicity" has led the public to believe.

The Federal Aviation Agency's air traffic control system, they said, is still "using the same hardware as we had 10 years ago, with planes now three times as fast."

The panelists included men experienced in the air, in flight control and in litigation involving air crashes.

The seminar was part of the program of the inaugural convention of the International Society of Barristers, an organization of trial lawyers whose membership is by invitation only.

The first session of the two-day seminar was devoted to stating the problem of air safety. Later sessions will develop recommendations for legislation, procedures and equipment which spokesmen said will be sent to affected public agencies and legislators.

Francis M. McDermott, with 22 years experience with government agencies, primarily in air traffic control, told of the frequency of near collisions. He said such reports by pilots "dried up" after the FAA announced each report would be investigated. McDermott, of McLean, Va., said pilots feared they would be grounded pending such investigations.

Donald W. Madole, a pilot, former FAA attorney and later attorney for American Airlines, predicted the air congestion would get worse. He cited a projection that airline fleets will increase by 75 per cent to 3,500 planes and general aviation by 100 per cent to 180,000 aircraft by 1977. Madole also quoted a Swedish air safety expert, Capt. Boe Lundberg, as predicting that in the near future a major air disaster somewhere in the world will be a daily occurrence.

Madole said the air traffic control system has "the same hardware as we had 10 years ago, with planes now three times as fast. The only thing different is that the operator has a little better headset."

Lee S. Kreindler of New York City, a lawyer who specialized in air crash cases, said the coming jumbo jets and supersonic transports will "add to the existing problem—a problem compounded by the greater range of speeds." Kreindler said develop-

A 3840

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 27, 1967

ment of safety devices lags "far behind development of the industry."

Kreindler said he knew of a \$30,000 anti-collision device being developed but said this would communicate only with another plane so equipped.

The New York lawyer said only a small percentage of planes are equipped with transponders, a device which makes radar detection and control more effective. He estimated the cost of equipping all aircraft with such devices at \$300 million.

McDermott brushed off talk about anti-collision devices as something that merely serves "to take the heat off the FAA."

Madole joined in with, "we still don't have a return on the hundreds of millions of dollars we put into the FAA" to develop a control system that would prevent collisions.

Two other lawyers who specialize in air crash cases joined Kreindler in criticism of airlines' safety publicity, calling it "deceptive to sell the public on the idea that it is safer to fly than to drive."

Craig Spangenberg of Cleveland said airlines use a passenger-mile basis for their claims, but on per hour travel time basis, flying is not safer. Spangenberg said rail travel is safest of all, and bus travel next.

Kreindler elaborated on what he called the "built-in deception of the (Passenger-mile) statistics." An airliner carrying 100 passengers New York to Los Angeles would on a single flight build up 300,000 accident-free passenger miles—equaling a man's 30-year accident free record in a car if he drove 10,000 miles a year.

Irving G. Swenson of Chicago, counsel for Northwest Airlines in litigation arising out of the Tell City, Ind., air disaster, said it is difficult to get a "meaningful comparison" of air and auto safety.

Using air travel Chicago to Miami for an example, he said it would be necessary to compile accident records of all persons who drove cars from Chicago to Miami within a given period of time to make such a comparison.

**L. B. J. Must Stop the Riots**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY**  
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the riots and violence in the streets of our cities across the land are of desperate concern to us all.

A particularly thoughtful editorial appeared in Tuesday morning's Orlando Sentinel and I want to share it with my colleagues:

## L. B. J. MUST STOP THE RIOTS

Since April 1 there have been 20 riots in as many cities across the land, and there is no end in sight.

What we are witnessing is a condition bordering on the state of anarchy where people are disregarding established laws of the nation and rules of society and are killing, maiming and looting to their heart's content.

It is not alarmist to say that if this condition continues this nation will eventually fall into the hands of its enemies.

Unrest in the cities has been blamed. It is certainly true that crowded housing conditions, lack of employment opportunities, and absence of recreation facilities may be contributing factors.

With the millions the federal government is spending on its poverty war, in time these lacks can be remedied. But doing good is not going to eliminate the professional agitator, the man who profits by riots, the man who very likely is paid or encouraged by the Communist party to see that riots take place.

The antiriot bill passed by the House and now in the Senate will help identify and punish the riot organizer who moves from state to state. It should become law.

But stronger measures, or measures of a different kind, are also needed. The individual states cannot cope with what appear to be spontaneous riots followed by looting, death, injuries and vast property damage, but the federal government can.

The President has not expressed himself sufficiently about this problem, and he should. The President should take the leadership in a strong approach to the problem of riots. He should call in the governors of the states, the Department of Justice. He should announce that this government is determined to end the reign of anarchy in the land.

He should say that Americans can no longer tolerate crime and violence in our streets and that the necessary steps will be taken to maintain order and protect the lives and property of citizens.

The alternative is chaos and death of the republic.

**WMAL Editorial on the Commissioners' Art Fund**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**  
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the week of July 9, 1967, WMAL broadcasted an editorial concerning a bill which I had previously introduced to establish a cultural enrichment program for the District of Columbia youngsters.

The bill would provide Washington children with the opportunity to become acquainted with the best of our Nation's culture. The text of the editorial follows:

## COMMISSIONERS' ART FUND

(Broadcast during the week of July 9, 1967)

Legislation to establish a Commissioners' Art Fund for Washington children has been lying virtually unnoticed since January. Yet this bill, designed to improve the cultural experience of countless children, deserves enthusiastic recognition and support.

The measure is sponsored by New York Congressman Abraham Multer, who points out that many cities conduct cultural enrichment programs for children. The Multer bill would provide Washington youngsters with concerts and theater, through which children would become acquainted with the best of our national culture. The Commissioners' Art Fund would also provide money for competitions to discover new talent and encourage young people to pursue excellence in the arts.

In Washington, cultural deprivation among children is a recognized weakness and, thus, we believe the Multer bill is vital. Washington civic organizations should rally behind the Commissioners' Art Fund plan and should urge its early adoption by Congress.

## United States Condemns Use of Poison

Gas

file  
EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, less than a month ago I expressed to my colleagues my deep concern over the use of poison gas by the United Arab Republic against the people of Yemen.

Because of my interest in this problem I wrote to Ambassador Arthur Goldberg and asked him to instigate an investigation of the charges against the United Arab Republic and take whatever appropriate action might be necessary.

I have received a reply from Ambassador Goldberg, and so that my colleagues may be aware of the U.S. policy in this regard I include the letter from Ambassador Goldberg in the RECORD at this point:

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE  
TO THE UNITED NATIONS,  
New York, N.Y., July 24, 1967.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WOLFF: Thank you for your letter of July 19 concerning the use of poison gas by Egypt in its war with Yemen.

I can assure you that we share your concern over the growing number of indications that gas is once again being used by the UAR Air Force against the local population in Yemen. As you may be aware, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has confirmed that the "U.S. News and World Report" article which you entered in the Congressional Record of June 29 was indeed a valid Red Cross report. The ICRC also announced that copies of the report were sent to the Governments of the United Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia as well as to both sides in Yemen. In addition, the Red Cross issued a statement on June 2 calling on the Yemeni combatants to give a solemn pledge not to use poison gas.

The United States position on this matter is quite clear and corresponds to the stated policy of almost all other governments throughout the world as reflected in the voting (91 in favor and 4 abstentions) on UNGA Resolution 2162B of 1966 which condemned the use of poison gas in warfare. The use of poison gases is clearly contrary to international law and we would hope the authorities concerned in Yemen heed the request of the ICRC not to resort in any circumstances whatsoever to their use.

In addition to the ICRC's findings, the US Government has been giving close attention to detailed information on the January gas bombing report involving Kitaf, which the Saudi Arabian Government provided to the UN and which was published as a UN document on April 6th. This report contains a number of indications that poison gas was used on that occasion. We are deeply disturbed at press reports that the agent used may have been some new type of nerve gas as this would introduce an entirely new weapon, not previously employed by any nation of the world.

While thus indicating its strong concern over reports on the use of gas in Yemen, the United States has not taken the lead in the handling of this matter at the UN. Saudi

July 27, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3841

Arabia, the neighboring country most directly affected and the source of much of the evidence, has already furnished detailed information on the question to the Security Council. However, the countries in the area have not yet formally requested UN consideration of the issue, either in the General Assembly or the Security Council. Nevertheless, the United States is continuing to urge all parties to abide by the ICRC request and to refrain from any use of poison gas.

Sincerely yours,  
ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG.

to his bleats for "freedom" over the last 30 years is that it is perfectly obvious even to a moron that he wants only his kind of freedom.

Not once in all that time has he joined a committee, or signed a petition, that was to help somebody less affluent, less advantaged, less able to cope with the immensity and complexity of the power structure.

If he had, perhaps we could believe him more. Anybody can be for his own kind of freedom; but unless we respect it for those we dislike or disagree with, nobody else will follow us or have faith in us.

## Blare of "Freedom" Has Tinhorn Ring

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by Sydney Harris that appeared in the Detroit Free Press, July 12, 1967.

Mr. Harris tells about the interesting attitude of an old friend—whose name I have deleted—toward "less government interference."

The article, entitled "Creating 'Vigilantism' Where None Exists," follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press, July 12, 1967]

BLARE OF "FREEDOM" HAS TINHORN RING

(By Sidney Harris)

My old friend has been bleating about "freedom" for more than 30 years. Ever since the early days of the New Deal, he has been calling for "less government interference."

What he means is less interference with him. He's quite content to see much more government interference with other people. In fact, he writes long and heated letters to his congressmen about it.

He wants tougher laws against men who oppose the draft. He thinks the government should send them to jail. He wants a government crackdown on pugnacious labor leaders. He would like to have the cops round up all the beatniks and put them away somewhere.

He thinks that war dissenters ought to be muzzled. School dropouts ought to be forced to go to work. Teachers who wear beards and quote "inflammatory" literature in classrooms ought to be dismissed. Theater owners who show dirty movies ought to be shut down.

He is for stronger police laws, more military actions, compulsory labor arbitration, more vigorous censorship, and the abolition of all obnoxious picketing. If possible, he would like to have the FCC ban all radio stations from playing rock-and-roll music.

What kind of "freedom" does he really believe in? The freedom to be \_\_\_\_\_, to look like him, dress like him, think like him, believe like him, and get rich like him.

"Hands off" is his motto when the government proposes to restrict in any way his freedom to run a business, manage a property, pay taxes, or engage in any sort of fiscal frolics.

"Hands on" is his motto when he looks with disgust at antics of criminals, labor leaders, agitators (anybody who wants to change the status quo is by definition an "agitator"), beatniks, dropouts, and all people who want different freedoms than he wants.

It has never occurred to him that maybe the reason no one had paid much attention

## For Total Mobilization To Solve Urban Crisis

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States today face the greatest internal crisis they have known since the Civil War of a century ago.

The senseless violence that is spewing out of the ghettos of city after American city, the resulting death and property destruction, and the near total breakdown of the forces of law and order—something that approached a state of anarchy in both Newark and Detroit—make such a conclusion well-nigh inescapable.

I have listened in this Chamber, this week, as my colleagues have risen, one after the other, to agonize out loud about the terrible nature of these events and to express their sense of disbelief that such things could be happening here in our beloved Nation.

This I can understand, for I share their agony—the sense of disbelief and bewilderment.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed even further by the seeming parallel between the attitudes of helplessness and hopelessness, as well as of anger, and the efforts to affix political blame for what is transpiring as well as the piecemeal "solutions" that are being proposed here in the midst of our mounting crisis, and the attitudes and posturing of those of our great-grandfathers who served in this Congress a little more than a century ago as the Union their great-grandfathers, in turn, had established moved inevitably toward disruption.

The urgency of our present crisis clearly demands something far better than this of us. Any attempt to fix the blame, now, for what is happening around us reminds me, for all the world, of two drivers arguing in the street over who was at fault for the accident they have just had while their critically injured passengers lie unattended and uncared for.

So the "plague on both your houses" editorial as carried in yesterday's edition of the New York Times, was probably called for and, under leave granted to do so, I now include it as part of these remarks:

## WHILE CITIES BURN

The nation has cause for deep concern if the leaders of both political parties are unable to forget political considerations when murder, arson and looting are sweeping some of its major cities. This grave domestic crisis demands a level and a quality of mature leadership that have been shocking in their absence.

Because he holds the highest office and therefore bears the highest responsibility both to act and to set an example, President Johnson offended most conspicuously in his pussyfooting response to the debacle in Detroit. He shilly-shallied for several hours in ordering the Army units into action in the city despite the pleas of local officials that troops were urgently needed. And when he did act, Mr. Johnson issued a proclamation and a personal statement both of which were clearly designed to place the entire political responsibility on Governor Romney.

It is no disgrace to either the Governor, a Republican, or to Mayor Cavanagh, a Democrat, that the situation in Detroit slipped out of local and state control. The fact that Governor Romney may be the Republican Presidential candidate next year may explain but cannot excuse President Johnson's nervous political posturing at this critical time.

But if the President's conduct was hesitant and strangely lacking in the quality of leadership, the statement issued by the Republican Coordinating Committee is a flagrant outrage. It is the most transparent kind of seedy politics to assert that these terribly difficult and complex problems, decades and even centuries in the making, have erupted "since the present Administration took office."

This shabby statement insults the nation's intelligence when it asserts that President Johnson's veto of a loosely drafted "crime-control bill" for the District of Columbia contributed to an upheaval a thousand miles away in Detroit or that the ludicrous anti-rioting bill already passed by the House would do the slightest bit of good.

"The root causes of discontent," the statement declares, "are of immediate and continuing concern to all of us." The Republican leaders nowhere state what those "root causes" are. There is not a single word about jobs, housing, health, care, education or other urban problems. Instead, the statement is replete with demagogic tales about unspecified factories manufacturing Molotov cocktails and unidentified riot organizers touring the country.

Because the statement was so misleading and so irresponsible, Senator Dirksen, that thick-skinned, battle-hardened political veteran, evidently could not bring himself to face up to a defense of it to skeptical reporters and ran away from his own press conference. It is no credit to either of them that former Governor Dewey shared in the drafting of this document and that former President Eisenhower associated his name with it.

It now appears that Congress will appoint a bipartisan joint committee to inquire into the riots. More good would be accomplished if the conservatives in both parties would re-examine their consciences and their voting records on the model cities bill, the rent-subsidy program, the rat-control bill, and many other measures before Congress. The new committee can accomplish little if its members from both parties do not rise above the execrable level established by Washington's political leaders in recent days.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I don't take any pleasure in such editorial spankings of either my party or yours, or our respective leaders and spokesmen—but I believe it does us well to heed them, for ours is the common responsibility, now, in deciding what can and is to be done,

A 3842

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 27, 1967

and we ought to be preparing to get at our task in as objective, constructive, and cooperative fashion as possible.

But there was another reason beyond that of publicly admitting we have both been "taken to the woodshed," that prompted me to insert the above editorial. That reason is because I believe the Times erred—and in doing so detracted from the force and effect of its appropriate criticism—when it felt impelled to add that sentence to its final paragraph which referred to the "good that would be accomplished if the conservatives in both parties would (now) re-examine their consciences and their voting records on the model cities bill, the rent-subsidy program, the rat-control bill, and (the) many other measures before Congress."

This is a line I have also heard some of my colleagues adopt here, in their remarks, this week—but it does not constitute a very valid argument if what we are searching for beyond, first, the restoration of law and order in our riot-torn cities, is a long-range solution that gets at the causes—the root causes—of the riots themselves. The reason it does not is that what the Times is talking about is a "crisis gimmick-programs approach" designed—primarily—to quiet and contain the ghettos."

Now those last 11 words are not mine—and that is why I have put quotation marks around them. I found them, in of all places, on the same editorial page of the Times in a published letter to its editor from Prof. Kenneth B. Clark, of New York City, whose remarks make more sense to me right now than anything I have heard here or read elsewhere the past few days. That letter was entitled "For Total Mobilization To Solve Urban Crisis," which I have adopted as the title of these remarks and, under leave again to do so, Professor Clark's letter is now set forth:

FOR TOTAL MOBILIZATION TO SOLVE URBAN CRISIS

To the EDITOR:

The reputation of The New York Times for incisive and distinguished editorials was enhanced by the series of editorials (July 16, 17 and 18) concerned with the difficult and complex problems inherent in the tragedy of Newark. These editorials are significant contributions to public education and should be required repeated reading for public officials responsible for the future of American cities.

If it is possible to salvage any positives from the tragic consequences of past neglect, discrimination and pervasive insensitivities which made Newark inevitable, old postures and explanatory clichés must give way to a serious and dispassionate search for solutions to critical urban problems.

In seeking the solutions to the problems of our cities and ghettos, the choices before us are limited. First, we can increase the number of state police, National Guard or Federal troops, which are easily available to put down "insurrections" within the ghettos and thereby turn them into compounds of frustration and discontent. Second, we can continue a crisis gimmick-programs approach designed to quiet and contain the ghettos. Or third, we can seek serious long-term solutions to longstanding problems of

crime and delinquency, criminally inferior education, subhuman housing and dangerous unemployment.

## SAME BENEFITS FOR ALL

Solutions consistent with a tough-minded self-interest of the privileged and with humanity must assure that the people of our ghettos have the same access to democracy, justice and mobility and the same choices which American democracy has provided for all other ethnic groups.

When our society was confronted with the threat of national survival implicit in an archaic approach to military defense and when our Government sought to meet the new challenges of space exploration, we demonstrated the seriousness of our concern by mobilizing the best brains available and providing them with the necessary financial resources and independence to do the necessary planning, research and development, and to seek and recommend appropriate solutions.

The problems of the stability of our cities and the problem of the ghettos are in a real and concrete sense equal in their threat to the survival of our nation. Our scientific and industrial genius needs to be organized now just as the nation organized its nuclear scientists for Los Alamos and its defense strategists at RAND.

The decision which America makes must now be made affirmatively and not by default. What we decide to do will determine whether the American experiment in democracy can work or must remain a mockery.

KENNETH B. CLARK,  
President, Metropolitan Applied Research Center and Professor of Psychology, the City College.

NEW YORK, July 21, 1967.

As you will note, Mr. Speaker, Professor Clark states we have three general choices concerning what is to be done about our developing crisis. The first of these, as some here are already suggesting, is to pour Federal moneys into "beefing up" State and local police forces. Even granting the urgency of bringing order out of chaos, this is, at best, clearly no "solution."

Professor Clark's suggestion for a second choice is—as I have already mentioned—the continuation of that "crisis gimmick-programs approach designed to quiet and contain the ghettos." I know I will get into an argument if I should attempt to relate the programs and pending bills the Times was talking about all into this category—so I will not even try that being content, instead, to point out that the same, again at best, offer only very distant and very partial "solutions." Certainly, this is true about the model city program which may prove to be the best of the several new approaches Congress has indicated a willingness to try. However, even if that program were now fully funded it would be well for the critics of those of us who supported its partial funding to remember that Secretary Weaver has even yet, not made up his mind as to which American cities are going to be favored with model cities funds.

The rent-subsidy program has already been amply debated here, so suffice it to point out that there are existing alternatives to it that are funded and that are working and that—in the mind of some of us, at least—there are also pending

proposed alternatives, such as the Percy homeownership plan of which I am a cosponsor, and which, if we had it now, might be of substantial value in rebuilding some of the devastated ghetto areas that we are undoubtedly going to be asked to help rebuild.

And, finally, as to that pesky "rat-control" bill, perhaps it was a mistake from the standpoint of images for the House to have turned it down. But what the liberal press has failed to realize, in its criticism of this action, is that the House Members who so voted were voting not "for rats" or "for economy-in-government," as has been suggested, but against the burgeoning categorical-grant programs Congress has been indulging in lately to the serious detriment of local flexibility in trying to meet local problems. And I do not know if it really matters now but, with Detroit so very much on all our minds, would the critics of this House action—including the Times—mind too much taking public note of the fact that Detroit, well prior to its recent trouble and all on its own, had practically cleaned up its own rat problem, reducing the incidence of rat-infested building by a whopping 96 percent?

In my view, Mr. Speaker, what the Detroit situation now demands of us is not passage of a rat-control bill but a thorough reexamination of the whole governmental and social structures on which we may too long have relied. For, as Charles Orlebcke, executive assistant to Michigan's Gov. George Romney, said about that city's tragedy:

We've got to try to see what went wrong. This is more than the wreckage of a city. It is a wreckage of our clichés, and that means a lot of things that the sociologists talk about.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think Professor Clark had a real point in suggesting to us, as our remaining third choice now, that we stop thinking in terms of "gimmick programs" that we evidently cannot resist overselling in our desire for votes or in our hope that they will somehow help "keep the lid on," and that instead we get down to work—mobilizing our undeniable scientific and industrial genius just as we did before in matching the Russian space challenge and in unlocking the secret to nuclear power—to find serious, long-term solutions to the longstanding and vastly complex human problems that, unsolved, will continue to tear at the very fabric of our society.

I confess I do not know how to get such an effort going. It would not be easy—enamored of those old clichés and so trapped in our own verbiage as we are; but perhaps if one or another kind of congressional investigations into the riots as now proposed gets started it might point us in that ultimate direction.

But I deeply believe that such an all-out effort must be made—and that on the success of it may well depend the future of what Professor Clark calls the American experiment in democracy.

July 27, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3825

Navy would use the 400-mile-range Spartan missile for SABMIS and also the Nike X radar. The ships would be built with special armor against nuclear blast and fallout.

Building a Nike X missile defense around the United States is gaining Johnson administration support in the wake of Red Chinese nuclear tests.

Congressional demands for a \$3-billion to \$10-billion version of Nike X will intensify this week if the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee releases as planned, its report on Chinese nuclear progress.

*slate*  
India Citizens Oppose Stand Against  
Israel

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the writer, Mr. Gobind Beehari Lal, of the following article, which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner, July 6, 1967, has excellent credentials. He is a member of the staff of the San Francisco Examiner, science writer for the Hearst Newspapers, since 1925. He taught physics at a college of the University of the Punjab, before coming to Berkeley, for research at the University of California, before the First World War.

Mr. Lal was born in Delhi, India, and was active in the Indian independence movement, in India and in the United States, until 1947. He received a Pulitzer Prize for science writing for the Hearst Newspapers in 1937, a Guggenheim fellowship for history of science research in 1955, a special citation for "Distinguished Services to Medicine" from the American Medical Association in 1958. He knew Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and many other makers of independent India and has maintained close relations with Indian affairs. Mr. Lal's article follows:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, July 6, 1967]

## INDIA CITIZENS OPPOSE STAND AGAINST ISRAEL

The majority of the people of India are opposed to the apparently pro-Arab attitude of the Indian Government.

The leading Indian newspapers and political and cultural leaders have openly condemned the Indian Foreign Office's pro-Egyptian statement, just before the outbreak of the Israel-Arab war.

People are asking the government: "When there was a war between India and Pakistan, what help did any of the Moslem countries give India? Did not Iran and Indonesia and the rest show their partisanship with Pakistan, a fellow Moslem country?"

## OFFSET

The continued hostility between India and Pakistan is the key to most of India's foreign policies. It is to offset the influence of Pakistan with Moslem nations that Indian officialism goes out of its way to be friendly with these nations.

With cordiality with China, support of America, and of so many Moslem states, Pakistan presents to India a dangerous challenge. Indian diplomatic moves are largely determined by this phenomenon.

Following her own election as the Prime Minister, Madame Indira Gandhi, genuinely loved and admired by the Indian people for her courage, hard work, idealism, patriotism, education, and good looks—made a Moslem Indian the president of India. This despite the fact that only 10 to 15 percent of India's population follow the Islamic faith.

## MOSLEMS

India's foreign minister, an internationally noted jurist, Dr. M. A. Chagla, is also a Moslem by faith. Both these topmost dignitaries are able men, but their positions are due to their faith.

The principle of excluding religion from political positions and jobs of state is usually observed in India; but it is also lost sight of in some crises.

What was the need of the Indian Foreign Office to make a statement favoring Egypt against Israel?

Leaving aside the present Israel-Arab conflict, it is important to understand the general historical background of the relations between the Indians and the Jews.

## ASYLUM

In history, when the Jews were persecuted by Europeans, they found welcome and generous asylum in India. About 2000 years ago, several thousand Jews, persecuted by Romans, fled to South India.

Here the Hindu king gave them land and made their leader a maharaja, and guaranteed to them fullest liberties allowed to Hindus.

Never was a Jew persecuted in Hindu India. Under British rule Englishmen of Jewish faith began to come for office or trade.

In the British established Indian colleges, Indian students were taught that "Shylock was a Jew," and Shylock was heartless.

## EMPERORS

However, it was Benjamin Disraeli, Queen Victoria's prime minister of Jewish parents, who first made this queen "The Empress of India," at a lavish coronation ceremony in Delhi, in 1877.

After World War I, Lloyd George sent Lord Reading, a professing Jew, as the British viceroy of India—an action that many British conservatives condemned. So English statesmanship tried to use Jewish brains to thwart Indian independence.

However, a number of Jews prominent in the Labour Party and even in the Liberal Party of England were sympathetic to the cause of Indian independence.

## AMERICA

But it was in the United States that the Jews, Americans, showed their most active and helpful sympathy with the Indian independence movement.

Many distinguished Jews aided the Indian cause, for example: Prof. Albert Einstein, U.S. Congressman Emanuel Celler, writers John Gunther and Mrs. Francis Gunther, Louis Fischer, biographer of Mahatma Gandhi, Rabbi Stephen Wise and so on.

Some of the most enthusiastic and effective Indian nationalists, like Dr. Taraknath Das of Columbia University, urged India, after her independence, to make an alliance with Israel.

## Jim Robinson Played It Rugged

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House

the heroic exploits on the battlefield of a former neighbor, Sgt. James Robinson. Sergeant Robinson was presented with the Congressional Medal of Honor at ceremonies in the Pentagon recently. He was given the medal posthumously.

Jim, as I knew him, was killed on April 11, 1966, when he charged and destroyed a Vietcong machinegun nest during Operation Abilene. But I knew of his valor and worth long before his exploits in Vietnam.

Jim was a rugged, 210-pound tackle on our high school football team in the late 1950's, less than a decade ago. In 1958, he was named all-league tackle in a tough Chicago suburban conference. Even then he stood out. Even then he was rugged. Even then he displayed the courage which later was to claim his life. Robinson had always wanted to play professional football. He played in a far tougher game, war, which is not a game at all. But he proved his worth.

Speaking of the Congressional Medal of Honor winner, his spirit as a marine and as a soldier can be typified by the words of his high school football coach, who said:

Jim was always in condition, ready for a tough game—a little bugged on physical fitness. He always contributed a host of tackles, even in defeat, and always played it rugged.

He knew what he was fighting for, too. Jim was deeply interested in foreign affairs and strongly in favor of the war. His father quoted young Jim as saying:

All you have to do is get out a map and look at Vietnam and you'll see that it is the key to the Far East and worth any price to keep it.

Yes, Jim Robinson proved his worth and in so doing proved, too, the worth of thousands of former athletes who are now in the armed services.

We owe much to young men such as Jim Robinson and to the parents who nurtured and loved them. We salute them all.

## Needed: A War on War in the Streets

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the riots which have been raging throughout the metropolitan centers of our Nation, are tragic evidence that a new approach to the racial problem is drastically needed.

Paul Hope, writing for the Washington Evening Star, has analyzed the situation and suggested some changes to help prevent these same events from occurring in the future.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues Mr. Hope's article which appeared in the July 24, 1967, edition of the Star.

The article follows:

NEEDED: A WAR ON WAR IN STREETS  
(By Paul Hope)

If the United States ever gets done in, it won't be because there's a Communist be-

A 3826

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 27, 1967

hind every tree, as the John Birch president, Robert Welch, likes to believe, but because the greatest power on earth couldn't find a way to solve its race problem.

One thing the Great Society has plenty of are wars—on poverty, disease, hunger and ignorance; the war in Vietnam. It's about time to declare war on the sharply escalating war in the streets of the nation's cities.

One of the first things that seems to be in order is for leaders, black and white, to quit making excuses for lawlessness. Of course the Negro has been downtrodden and discriminated against for 300 years, but that doesn't give him the right to shoot up a city and loot the stores.

A man who makes a firebomb and throws it through a shop window is not doing it because his grandfather was a slave. A sniper who climbs on top of a building and shoots at firemen and lawmen—even at bystanders of his own race—is not doing it because he doesn't have a job. He's doing it just for the plain hell of it.

Nonviolent marches and picketing in behalf of a cause are one thing—pillaging a city is another.

It's time politicians quit offering the Negro pie in the sky and started real work on his problems.

The impractical hue and cry to get rid of the ghettos is a case in point. As a practical matter there is no way to get rid of the ghettos.

The government could spend \$100 billion a year rebuilding cities and most whites still would live in one place and most Negroes in another—that's just a plain fact of life until both races really are ready to accept one another as true brothers and live, love and be happy together.

Slum clearance projects don't necessarily increase understanding or communication between the races. Look at the Southwest Washington redevelopment area where Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey lives in an expensive new apartment building.

Southwest Washington was a Negro slum until the bulldozers moved in and fancy new apartments and townhouses were built. Where did the Negroes go? They aren't living in the high-cost apartments or the \$40,000 townhouses. They just shifted from the old ghetto to a new one.

Urban renewal projects have produced rows of 20-story apartment buildings for Negro tenants in Southside Chicago. About all that did was stack the ghetto skyward instead of having it spread out on the ground. The Negroes on the top floor may be closer to God but not much nearer to an understanding with the white people who run the city—and sometimes it's a long wait for the elevator.

The nation apparently is going to have to live with the fact that many of its major cities will be inhabited primarily by Negroes. The poor and the ignorant from the rural areas keep flooding into the cities looking for their pot of gold; and sometimes they're lucky if they can find a pot of beans.

The only real answer for the Negro in the ghetto is education. The economy can use only so many ditchdiggers, street cleaners and garbage men.

The solution to uplifting the minds and dreams of the Negroes and preparing them for jobs would seem not so much in prettying up the ghettos but rather in a massive infusion of money into the education systems of the troubled cities. Give a Negro an education and training so he can get a decent job and he will make his surroundings more comfortable on his own.

It seems time to quit worrying so much about racial balances in schools and concentrate on giving the Negro an adequate education wherever he happens to live.

If it takes one teacher to every five students instead of one to 30 to get the job done, then that's what should be provided.

If it takes a policeman stationed at every school to keep a lid on rowdyism in the classroom, then that should be provided, too. It probably would do more good having a policeman around to help keep order in the schools than on the street passing out traffic tickets.

Maybe it is true, as so often has been said, that many of the present generation of ghetto youth are lost. But that's no reason to lose the next generation.

If the cities are to have Negro majorities, the Negroes must eventually be given, and they must be able to assume, the responsibility for running them.

The firebomb and the sniper's gun must be traded in for a responsible place in society. The nation cannot afford to let lawlessness become a way of life in its industrial heartland.

## What Price a Soldier's Life?

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced H.R. 5724 which provides some reasonable benefit for the survivors of retired military personnel who have devoted their entire lives to the service of the United States of America. Without going into the details of what benefits are presently available, let me summarize by simply saying that no class of Americans is as neglected as the survivors of a military retiree. In civil service, in private industry, in local government, the provisions for the survivors of retirees are much more generous.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Department of Defense will recognize this inequity and see that it must be corrected if we are to be able to offer the incentive which attracts men to a career of military service. Until we do such things, we have no hope of eliminating the draft and creating a truly professional military service.

Mr. Speaker, recently in the San Francisco Chronicle-Examiner, Mr. Jerry Belcher, staff writer, wrote a fine article which gives a real insight into the disparity of treatment between military retirees and their survivors and civil service retirees. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the article which appeared in the July 16 issue of the Chronicle-Examiner:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle-Examiner, July 16, 1967]

## WHAT PRICE A SOLDIER'S LIFE?

(By Jerry Belcher)

A hero is dead, killed in action in Vietnam. It happens every day. Last week it happened to 282 Americans, since 1961 it has happened to more than 11,000.

There is no way, of course, to put a price on a hero—and any man killed in action is a hero, at least to his family.

But in cold, economic terms, what does the death of a soldier mean to a soldier's family?

To put the question into human perspective, what did it mean to one of the 282 men killed last week—First Lt. Gatiin (Jerry) Howell of Alameda?

Lt. Howell was 31. He had served his time, fulfilled his legal obligation to his country, as an enlisted Marine before the war in Vietnam started.

He became a school teacher in San Francisco after that hitch and he married Nancy Ebert. But, as he said a few days before his death, he felt a further responsibility.

He re-enlisted, earned a commission. To do so he gave up his new home, took leave from his teaching job, left his pretty young wife. He was the father of two little boys.

On July 4, he volunteered to lead a rescue mission to bring back the bodies of fallen Marines in a bloody battle near Con Thien. He lived through that. But on July 7, he was killed by enemy artillery fire.

Nancy Howell received official word of her husband's death on July 10. Her two sons were too young to understand what the telegram meant.

On July 11, a solemn Marine Corps officer came to Mrs. Howell's Alameda apartment and presented her with a check for \$3000. The Marine Corps called it a "death gratuity."

If Jerry Howell had not felt his sense of responsibility, had stuck to teaching, and died as the result of an on-the-job accident on campus, the check from the school department would have been for \$4112.

If he had been a longshoreman, the check would have been \$4640.

If he had been a street sweeper for the City of San Francisco, the check would have been made out in the amount of \$4218.

If Jerry Howell had been an infantry private, the check would have been for only \$1236.

## UNTIL DEATH

But the immediate check is not all there is. Soon, Mrs. Howell will begin receiving monthly payments from the Veterans Administration—Dependency Indemnity Compensation. There are variations, but the widow of an officer of his rank and length of service will receive about \$184 a month until her death or remarriage.

A private's widow would receive \$137 a month. A five star general's wife, \$386 a month.

By comparison, the widow of a San Francisco policeman of Howell's age and time in service (6½ years) would receive his full pay of \$776 a month until the time of his retirement age of 55, after which she would get \$338 a month for the rest of her life.

## MORE THAN \$200,000

For a man of Howell's age at death, in 25 years, that would amount to more than \$200,000. The VA benefits to a soldier's widow would amount to less than \$65,000. And if the soldier's widow remarries, she loses her benefit.

But that's not the whole fiscal story. There is Social Security and there is California State Workmen's Compensation to consider.

A serviceman's widow with two children will receive between \$66 and \$368 a month from Social Security. (Mrs. Howell probably will get between \$250 and \$300.) When the children reach 18, their benefits will end. If the widow remarries her benefit will be cut off.

## NOT ELIGIBLE

A policeman's widow, however, is not eligible for the Social Security benefits.

As for State Workmen's Compensation: A policeman is not eligible, and neither is a soldier. But a street sweeper or a longshoreman is. The family of a longshoreman or a street sweeper who dies in the line of duty will receive from the state up to \$21,000 paid in bi-monthly installments of \$140.

A serviceman's widow also will receive \$10,000 from GI Insurance, but that, like Social Security, is paid for over the years by the individual.